

REMARKS

With respect to the Office Action dated September 13, 2005, Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 5 and 21-23 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13 and 15-18 were rejected under U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,727,940 ("Oka et al."). Furthermore, claims 2-4, 11, 14 and 19 were rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Oka et al. and/or U.S. Patent No. 6,317,127 ("Daily et al.").

In response, Applicant has amended the independent claims 1, 10, 13 and 15 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references. As amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that the independent claims 1, 10, 13 and 15 are not anticipated by Oka et al., and requests that these independent claims, as well as the pending dependent claims 2-7, 11, 12, 14, 16-19 and 21-23, be allowed.

A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1, 10, 13 and 15

The Office Action has rejected the independent claims 1, 10, 13 and 15 under U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Oka et al. As amended, the independent claim 1 recites a method of providing images to a remote site comprising:

*"sensing an image of a scene;
establishing a connection with a remote site;
transmitting the sensed image to the remote site, the sensed image
including all subimages that can be selected from the remote site;
receiving a selection of a subimage of the sensed image from the
remote site;
generating the subimage from the sensed image; and
transmitting the subimage to the remote site."*

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP §2131.

As correctly stated in the Office Action on page 2, "Oka et al teaches that only the sub-region selected by a remote user is transmitted to the remote user." The amended independent claim 1 recites the element of "*transmitting the sensed image to the remote site, the sensed image including all subimages that can be selected from the remote site*" (emphasis added). Since the cited reference of Oka et al. teaches that only the sub-region selected by a remote user is transmitted to the remote user, Oka et al. does not disclose transmitting a sensed image that includes "*all subimages that can be selected from the remote site*," as recited in the amended claim 1. Therefore, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Oka et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 10, 13 and 15, which recite similar limitations. Therefore, the amended independent claims 10, 13 and 15 are also not anticipated by Oka et al. and should be allowed.

B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-7, 11, 12, 14, 16-19 and 21-23

Each of the dependent claims 2-7, 11, 12, 14, 16-19 and 21-23 depends on one of the independent claims 1, 10, 13 and 15. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the claim amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Bronson

Date: January 13, 2006

By: Thomas H. Ham
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300